

NOTES ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF LEUCOSPERMUM R.BR.: II.

J. P. ROURKE

(*Compton Herbarium, Kirstenbosch*)

ABSTRACT

Two new combinations, *Leucospermum rodolentum* (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke and *Leucospermum calligerum* (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke, are proposed. Additional evidence is presented to support the view that R. A. Salisbury was responsible for the taxonomic part of Joseph Knight's book, *On the cultivation of the plants belonging to the natural order Proteaceae*. London, 1809.

INTRODUCTION

Several new name combinations in *Leucospermum* have already been published by the present author prior to the appearance of a complete revision of the genus. In order to bring the nomenclature of *Leucospermum* up to date in accordance with the currently accepted rules, two further combinations must be made. Only the immediately relevant synonymy is given in each case. All types quoted have been seen by the present author. This paper concludes the series "Notes on the nomenclature of *Leucospermum*".

Leucospermum rodolentum (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke, comb. nov.

Leucadendrum rodolentum Salisb. ex Knight in Knight, Cult. Prot.: 58 (1809)-basionym. Iconotype: Bot. Repos.: t.294 (1803).

Protea candicans Andr., Bot. Repos.: t.294 (1803) non Thunberg (1800).

Leucospermum candicans (Andr.) Sweet in Sweet, Hortus Suburbanus Londinensis: 21 (1818); Phillips in Fl. Cap. 5: 628 (1912).

Andrews published a brief description and an excellent colour plate of this species which he named *Protea candicans* in 1803 (See Plate 1). Since this name is a later homonym of Thunberg's *Protea candicans* (1800), it must be rejected. *Leucospermum candicans* is also inadmissible as Sweet merely transferred the epithet from *Protea* to *Leucospermum* without providing a description. The next legitimate epithet available is taken from *Leucadendrum rodolentum* Salisb. ex Knight.

Leucospermum calligerum (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke, comb. nov.

Leucadendrum calligerum Salisb. ex Knight in Knight, Cult. Prot.: 60 (1809)-

Accepted for publication 19th July, 1969.



basionym. Type: Dry places, Twenty-four rivers, *Niven* 41, holotype in herb. Salisbury (K), isotype in herb. J. E. Smith (LINN).

Protea pubera L., *Mantissa Altera*: 192 (1771)-nom. superfl. Type: Sheet No. 116.37 (LINN).

Leucospermum puberum (L.) R.Br. in Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond **10**: 100 (1810); Phillips in Fl. Cap. **5**: 634 (1912).

When Linnaeus described *Protea pubera* in the *Mantissa Altera* he cited *Leucadendron oleaefolium* Berg. as a synonym, thus making *Protea pubera* L. a superfluous name, which, being illegitimate must be rejected. The next legitimate specific epithet that can be applied to this species is taken from *Leucadendrum calligerum* Salisb. ex Knight, a name given to a collection made by James Niven at Twenty-four rivers (above Porterville C.P.), at which locality it is still common today.

The holotype of *Leucospermum calligerum* (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke is at Kew and bears the following note in the handwriting of R. A. Salisbury.

"Pubera L. 41 Niven Divaricata 4—5 ft high, dry places 24 rivers district.

It answers to Linne's descr. of his pubera Mant. p.192 but certainly not *L. oleaefolium* Berg. *Calligerum* would be a good name for it."

Stafleau (1967:241) points out that Knight's types are unknown. This is hardly surprising since it is unlikely that Knight ever possessed an herbarium himself. But a high proportion of the names published by Knight can be typified by specimens in Salisbury's herbarium.

Britten (1886) discussed at length the question of the authorship of the taxonomic part of Knight's book "*On the cultivation of the plants belonging to the natural order Proteaceae*" and advanced very convincing evidence from numerous sources to support his contention that R. A. Salisbury was responsible for the text of the greater part of this work.

It is strange that no reference has ever been made to the very revealing clues that are to be found in the notes attached to Salisbury's specimens, now in the Burchell collection at Kew. The notes and manuscript names are invariably the same notes and names which appear in Knight's book. In the example quoted above ("*Calligerum* would be a good name for it"), it is obvious that Salisbury coined the name "*calligerum*" although Knight published it. The agreement between Salisbury's notes and names on his herbarium material and the notes and names in Knight's book is too consistent to be merely coincidental. Indeed, it is possible that Salisbury's annotated herbarium material may well

PLATE I.

The iconotype of *Leucospermum rodolentum* (Salisb. ex Knight) Rourke. Plate 294 from H. C. Andrews' "*Botanists Repository*", published in April 1803. The plant figured had flowered in Hibbert's collection at Clapham in 1802.

constitute the manuscripts referred to by Knight in his preface (pg VII), which he "found so useful in every sheet". This evidence confirms Britten's opinion and clearly demonstrates the very significant part played by Salisbury in the production of Knight's book.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Visits to European herbaria to examine type material were made possible by the award of the Smuts Memorial Fellowship in Botany by the University of Cape Town. I also wish to express my appreciation to Prof. E. A. Schelpe for his advice and guidance on nomenclatural matters.

REFERENCES

- BRITTEN, J. 1886. On the nomenclature of some *Proteaceae*. *J. Bot., Lond.* **24**: 296-300.
KNIGHT, J. 1809. *On the cultivation of the plants belonging to the natural order Proteaceae*. London.
ROURKE, J. P. 1967. Notes on the nomenclature of *Leucospermum*. Part I. *Jl S. Afr. Bot.* **33**: 263-268.
STAFLEAU, F. A. 1967. Taxonomic literature. *Regnum Veg.* **52**: 1-556.